LIST OF UN PAPERS AND OUTCOMES FOR THE 21st SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS		
AGENDA ITEM	**UN PAPER**	**OUTCOME/DISCUSSION**
1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA The meeting agenda was adopted. Mr Benasai served as chairman and Mr. Wybenga as vice chairman.		
2(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PROVISIONS FOR THE TRANSPORT OF GASES		
2 (a) Gas cylinders and other gas receptacles and Multiple element gas containers (MEGCs)	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/22(EIGA)	This paper provided consolidated text comprising the proposed requirements for gas cylinders and Multi-Element Gas Containers based on the previous work of the UN Working Group on Gas Cylinders and Multi-Element Gas Containers. The working group used this document as a basis for their discussions. Two major issues addressed by the working group included conformity assessment and cylinder markings. These issues were considered and requirements were adopted accordingly.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/27(USA)	All of the issues addressed in the US paper were considered by the working group. The US is satisfied with the manner in which the issues were addressed in the final text developed by the working group.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/30(CGA)	On the basis of the decision taken by the working group not to address cryogenic cylinder requirements in the 1999-2000 biennium and because the proposed requirements were not considered to cover all types of cryogenic receptacles, CGA agreed to withdraw their paper. Packing instruction P203 for cryogenic receptacles now indicates "Cryogenic receptacles conforming to the construction, testing and filling requirements approved by the competent authority are authorized." ISO' s technical committees TC 261 and TC 58 are developing an international design and construction standard for cryogenic cylinders. RSPA will monitor this effort.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/38(France) Marking of Gas Receptacles	This paper proposed markings for gas receptacles consistent with those in the ISO/DIS 13679 Stamp Marking standard. The working group considered this proposal along with INF.46 (USA) which also provided a marking proposal. The working group considered both proposals and reached a consensus on the markings to be included in the UN Model Regulation.
2(b) DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS, INCLUDING THE MODEL REGULATIONS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS AND THE MANUAL OF TESTS AND CRITERIA		
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/7 (Secretariat) Consolidation of draft amendments adopted by the Sub-Committee during the 16th, 17th and 18th sessions.	This paper included a consolidated version of draft amendments to the 11th revised edition of the UN Model Regulations. The Committee reviewed and ratified the proposed text in this document along with additional amendments adopted during the 21st session. A final consolidated list of amendments for the 12th revised edition of the UN Model Regulations will be developed by the Secretariat.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/13 (Argentina) Classification of new unclassified goods	This paper proposed to include text in the UN Recommendations indicating that the consignor and the manufacturer are responsible for classifying dangerous goods. This is already covered in 2.0.0, 1.1.1.1 and 5.1.1.2 of the Recommendations. The US did not support the Argentine paper. The US also did not agree that it is necessary to indicate that the competent authority may review the classification or verify it through laboratory testing. Provisions specifying the responsibilities or authority of the competent authority are not typically included in the Model Regulations. This paper received no support and was not adopted by the Committee.

	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/24 4-Nitrophenylhydrazine	This paper was not initially rejected based on concerns raised by several experts that considered the material to be a Division 4.1 desensitized wetted explosive. The US developed an INF paper (INF.65) during the session to take account of the comments to classify 4-Nitrophenylhydrazine, with not less than 30% water by mass as a desensitized explosive. This alternative proposal was adopted.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/2 (IMO) Editorial and technical amendments to the UN Model Regulations	This paper included the proposals developed by IMO which identified minor differences between the UN Model Regulation and the IMDG Code, Amendment 30. The US submitted an INF paper (INF. 25) to facilitate the discussions and to make recommendations on how to reach agreements and resolve the differences. A working group was convened under the direction of the Vice chairman and consequential amendments were developed (see INF.68).
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/11 (JAPAN)) UN Nos. 0503 and 3268 Gas generators for seat-belts	This paper proposed to amend the proper shipping name of GAS GENERATORS FOR SEAT-BELTS in column 2 of the Dangerous Goods List and Special Provision 280 (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/36/Add.1, page 7 & 9) to read:" ACTUATORS FOR SEAT-BELT PRETENSIONERS". The Japanese proposal to include seat belt gas generators in the description for UN 0503 and 3268 was not adopted.
	ST/SG/AC.10//2000/19 (Germany) Special provision 307 INF 19 & 40	The German proposal intended to introduce under UN 2067 mixtures of ammonium nitrate and substances such as potassium chloride, ammonium phosphate and ammonium sulphate and mixtures containing more than 0.4% organic or combustible substances. The Committee agreed to adopt the alternative proposal by Germany to amend paragraph (c) of SP307 to cover all inorganic materials as follows: "(c) other mixtures of ammonium nitrate with more than 70% ammonium nitrate (e.g. mixtures containing potassium chloride, ammonium phosphide, ammonium sulphide) or ammonium sulphate with more than 45% and ammonium nitrate with less than 70% ammonium nitrate". SP307 was adopted during the 18th session (see 2000/7). The paper also proposed that in the first sentence of special provision 307 the term " uniform mixtures" should be amended to " uniform non-segregating mixtures". The US did not support this proposal. The US believed that the formulations mentioned in the German paper are covered by the current SP 307 (see document 2000/7) as adopted at the 18th session. We opposed the proposal to change the term "uniform mixtures" to "uniform non-segregating mixtures". The German proposal to amend the words "uniform mixtures" was not adopted but the Committee did agree to delete the word "compatible" as written in 2000/7, SP 307 (b).
	ST/SG/AC.10//2000/10 (Australia, Germany and Sweden) Chapter 5.3 (Limited Quantities) INF 15, 17, 21, 24, 26, 34, 42, 43, 50	This paper addressed the issue of placards for transport units carrying dangerous goods in limited quantities. It proposed to require a placard representing the hazard of a material carried in limited quantities only when the transport unit carries a single class/division and to require an "LQ" placard for mixed loads. Some experts including the US considered it premature to take a decision on the placarding of transport units. They thought that the placard proposed by Australia, Germany, and Sweden would not be acceptable to all countries or all transport modes, and that this could create more problems than it would solve. Others hoped that a decision would be taken at the present session since they deemed it necessary to identify transport units containing limited quantities. Experts noted that the IMDG Code requires a marking already but felt that this marking did not go far enough, preferring instead a marking within a diamond. The drafters of -2000/10 replaced their paper with the proposal in INF 57 to attempt to take into account of comments and concerns raised by a number of parties. The proposal in INF 57 was not adopted.

	ST/SG/AC.10//2000/36 (IATA) Chapter 5.4	This paper proposed that the COE reconsider its decision requiring the UN number appear before the proper shipping name in the basic description on the transport document. The US supported this paper and had submitted an information paper putting forth additional comments. However, given the opinions expressed, IATA suggested, and the COE agreed, to allow the following optional sequence: -UN number/ proper shipping name/ class, division, subsidiary risk/ packing group.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/3 (Belgium and Netherlands) Plastics packaging for nitric acid ST/SG/AC.10/2000/ INF 11 (UK) Plastics packaging for nitric acid	The Belgium paper was replaced with INF 11 from the UK. The packing instruction for Nitric Acid, other than red fuming with not more than 70% nitric acid, UN 2031, PG II is P802 which disallows the use of single plastic packagings, such as jerricans, plastics, non-removable heads (3H1). The paper stated that 3H1 jerricans have been authorized for use in the ADR/RID and 49 CFR for more than 15 years for UN 2031, PGII, without any known incidents. Belgium and the Netherlands proposed to change the packing instruction P802 for UN 2031, PG II to P001 with the following special packing provision: "PP XX for UN No. 2031 the permissible period for use for plastics packagings shall be two years from the date of manufacture only with competent authority approval if concentration higher than 55%". This proposal would allow the continued use of packagings which are presently allowed in the current RID/ADR and IMDG Code. The US supported this proposal in principle. The COE adopted all proposals in INF 11 with minor amendments to proposals 1 and 2 (see CRP. 2/Add.1).
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/17 (ICCA) Comments on ST/SG/AC.10/2000/2	This paper commented on the IMO proposals in ST/SG/AC.10/2000/2 relative to self-reactive substances and provided alternative proposals. These alternative proposals were adopted and will be incorporated into the 12th edition of the UN Model Regulations and it was agreed that IMO would consider adopting these in Amendment 31 of the IMDG Code.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/39 (USA) Packing instruction P904	P904 which applies to Genetically modified micro-organisms currently indicates that packagings according to P001 and P002 may be used for the transport of genetically modified microorganisms. However, the packing instruction does not indicate the packing group level for testing the packagings. The US proposed that the words "conforming to the packing group III performance level" be added after the words "Packagings according to P001 and P002" in P904. The COE adopted the US proposal.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/18 (ICPP) Reprocessing of IBC's	This paper contained no proposal but indicated an intent to develop requirements for the repair for FIBC's. In the course of the discussion of document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/18 (CEFIC, ICCR, ICIBCA, ICPP) "Remanufacturing, repair and routine maintenance of IBC's during the July meeting 2000 the expert from Germany had suggested to elaborate similar requirements also for FIBC's. This paper informed the COE of ICPP's interest in preparing such requirements for FIBCs. Several experts indicated that any efforts to define repair requirements for FIBCs should include all interested parties (e.g. FIBCA in the US). Some experts stated that they were not convinced that it is necessary to develop requirements for repairing FIBCs but that they would not object to such proposals in light of the fact that any participant of the UN Committee can submit proposals.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/5 (Belgium) Remanufacturing, repair and routine maintenance	This paper proposed both editorial and substantive amendments to the requirements adopted by the Sub-Committee for the remanufacturing, repair and routine maintenance of IBC's. The first proposal in the Belgium paper relative to definitions was not adopted, however, the alternative Belgium proposal to group all definitions concerning packagings together. Except for proposal 3 relevant to paragraph 4.1.2.5 the proposals were adopted with editorial changes(see CRP.2/Add.1).

	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/37 (ICCR, ICCP, ICIBCA and ICCA) Remanufacturing, repair and routine maintenance	This paper commented on the Belgium paper (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/5). The proposals in this paper were used in considering the Belgium proposals and the adopted amendments(see discussion above).
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/15 (UK) 6.3.3	This paper proposed a new test report for Division 6.2 packagings. The US supported this paper and the paper was adopted by the COE with some minor changes (see CRP.2).
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/3 (Argentina) Packagings for paints and inks	In this paper Argentina proposed to harmonize the requirements for paints and inks in the IMDG Code and UN Recommendations. The IMDG Code, Amendment 30, has been harmonized with the 11th UN edition making irrelevant some of the points raised by Argentina. Argentina stated they would reassess their paper.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2000/7 (Argentina) W marks for large packagings`	This paper proposed to add provisions for using a W mark for large packagings. This proposal was not adopted since W mark provisions are already covered in the Model Regulation for Large Packagings.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/1 (Germany) Report of the informal working group on new provisions for the transport of solid substances in bulk containers.	This paper summarized the findings of the informal working group, which met in Bonn, 5-7 April 2000, on new provisions for the transport of solid substances in bulk in freight containers. The issue of transport of bulk solids was deferred to the 2001-2002 biennium since the proposed text was not considered to be complete and acceptable for adoption in the 12th edition of the UN Model Regulations.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/16 (UK) Transport of solids in bulk containers	This paper commented on the proposed requirements for bulk containers. The paper proposed requirements for the design, construction and approval of bulk containers other than freight containers for incorporation in 6.8.3 of the Model Regulations. The US did not support adopting provisions for the transport of solids in bulk containers at this session of the Committee and the issue was deferred to the 2001-2002 biennium.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/20 (Norway) Ammonium nitrate emulsions INF.9, INF.14, INF.18, INF.37, INF.41 and INF.66	In this paper Norway proposed several amendments based on the outcome of the working group on classification of ammonium nitrate emulsions. The paper proposed that a new entry be created for "AMMONIUM NITRATE EMULSION, intermediate for blasting explosives, Class 5.1, PG III" with new special provisions. See INF 9 & INF 66 discussion below.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/14 (Canada) Ammonium nitrate emulsions INF.9, INF.14, INF.18, INF.37, INF.41 and INF.66	Canada noted that there is considerable variation in the classification for transport of ammonium nitrate emulsions in various jurisdictions, and that due to the need for a quick resolution, Canada is prepared to support the Norwegian proposal in -2000/20, despite reservations on the adequacy of the proposed Test series 8. See INF 9 & INF 66 discussion below.

	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/INF 9 & ST/SG/AC.10/2000/INF 66	A working group was convened during the session to consider all of the documents submitted. The US said that the informal working group which had met during the current biennium had already put forward good proposals at the Engene (Norway) meeting in October 1999, and that it had only been at the last session of the Sub-Committee that some delegations had called these proposals in question, at the level of the working group. The working group had then introduced new tests, without the publication of the results, on the understanding that the results would be communicated at the session of the Committee; that had not happened. The US therefore, was against a new meeting of the informal inter-sessional working group because it would only delay the solution of an urgent problem given the absence of a precise mandate for the working group and because there was no assurance that the test results would be available and finally because such informal meetings were expensive. The US would possibly prefer a meeting of a working group during the Sub-Committee's ordinary session in July 2001. The COE finally decided to adopt a provisional solution which was to classify these substances in Division 5.1 Packing Group II and to leave to the competent authorities the responsibility of determining the conditions for carriage. A search for a definite solution should be made during the forthcoming biennium. A working group is scheduled for April 2001.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/13 (Japan and USA)	In this paper Japan and US proposed that the test methods for lithium batteries be revised. The proposed test methods were substantially the same as those agreed to by the working group convened in Ottawa, Canada in March 2000. This paper along with ST/SG/AC.10/2000/25 and ST/SG/AC.10/2000/40 were considered by a working group chaired by the vice chairman. The working group reviewed the documents and agreed to the proposed amendments to the Model Regulations and Manual of Tests and Criteria. The working group adopted the text proposed in 2000/13 with the exception of the T6 Internal short circuit (crush) test. The alternative T6 test proposed by France in INF.31 was adopted instead of the one proposed in 2000/13.The test proposed by France is consistent with the impact test in UL 1642. This test was considered to be more realistic with what may occur in an incident and is less subject to broad interpretations of results. The text agreed to by the working group is provided in INF.81.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/25 (USA) Lithium Batteries	In this paper the US proposed that special provision 188 applicable to testing small lithium batteries be revised and that special provision 287 applicable to exceptions for shipping uncharged batteries be deleted. Under the proposal lithium batteries are subject to testing and certain cells and batteries are no longer exempt from transport as dangerous goods. The proposal to delete SP 287 was also adopted. A new special provision xxx was adopted to provide exceptions for prototype batteries that are transported for purposes of testing. The specific text agreed to by the working group is provided in INF.81.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/40 (Japan)	In this paper Japan proposed additional exceptions for button cell batteries. The working group did not agree to adopt this proposal since there was no clear definition for button cell batteries. However, to address the concerns raised by Japan it was agreed to revise the applicability of the tests for lithium cells or batteries which differ from a tested type in paragraph 38.3.2.1(a) of the Manual of Tests and Criteria by adding "0.1 g or 20% by mass whichever is greater" in place of "20% by mass" .
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/8 (Australia) Rubber Shoddy, SP 223	This paper proposed that rubber shoddy should be excepted from the Regulations when it does not meet the applicable classification criteria by adding SP 223 in the DGL. This proposal was adopted.

	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/35 and INF.19 (Austria) Sulphur, SP 242	This paper proposed to delete SP 242, which is currently applied to SULPHUR, UN 1350. SP 242 exempts sulphur from the scope of Recommendations when transported in quantities of less than 400 kg or when carried in a stabilised form (e.g. prills, granules, pellets, pastilles or flakes). Austria cited an incident involving sulphur in which responders lacked the information normally available. Austria also noted the original reason for including Sulphur was the formation of SO2 in a fire. The US did not support this paper given that the decision to include SP242 years ago was based on the minimal risk posed by this substance when transported in non-bulk quantities and it did not meet the classification criteria. The COE did not adopt the Austrian proposal. However, contrary to the wishes by the US, the COE did agree to a verbal proposal by France to only exempt those specific forms of sulphur not liable to produce dust regardless of amounts. Therefore, SP 242 is amended by deleting "when it is transported in quantities of less than 400 kg per package, or".
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/INF.48 (Netherlands) Fireworks	The Netherlands submitted this proposal to highlight the need to ensure that the classification system for explosives defined in the UN Model Regulations and Test Manual was followed. The paper was submitted in response to a serious accident in the Netherlands involving display fireworks that were stored in a warehouse located in a residential area. The Netherlands claimed that the fireworks involved in the incident were incorrectly classified as 1.4G although they should have been classified in Division 1.3 or 1.1. The paper proposed that a working group be established to review the classification criteria. The US indicated that the classification criteria are adequate and that there was no need to revise the classification criteria. The problem was one of properly applying the existing criteria. The expert from the Netherlands agreed that the classification system for explosives should not be called into question, but that the practical application of the system should be reviewed and enhanced. He stated that he would prepare a proposal for the July 2001 session of the SCOE.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/33 (UK) Editorial Amendments to Chapter 4.1	The UK proposed a number of amendments to Chapter 4.1 but these were not all accepted by the COE. As a result of discussions an alternate proposal was developed and adopted (see CRP.2).
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/INF3 (UIC) and ST/SG/AC.10/2000/INF44 (USA)	These INF papers addressed the issue of how to determine the applicable test pressure for determining the appropriate portable tank for a particular dangerous good. UIC said that it is difficult for portable tank operators to implement the provision of Chapter 4.2 since the minimum test pressure values given in the T codes specified in 4.2.4.2 and indicated for dangerous goods in the DGL were not the only means of determining the appropriate test pressure. After some discussion it was agreed that UIC and the US would draft a joint proposal for the 19th session of the SCOE to simply indicate that the test pressure specified in the T code is the applicable test pressure.
	ST/SG/AC.10/2000/INF22 (UK)	In this proposal the UK informed the meeting of the progress made on the draft standard ISO/EN 16104 which addresses the testing of UN packagings as specified in 6.1.5 of the Model Regulations. The UK representative further indicated that a final vote would take place in the Spring of 2001. He indicated that the proposals for amendments to Chapter 6.1 in INF.22 were based on the draft ISO/EN 16104. He also planned to submit proposals on other issues identified in the document during the next biennium. A number of delegations expressed concern with the proposal to adopt changes to the UN Model Regulations on the basis of a draft ISO standard and because these new proposals were not submitted in a formal paper. Germany supported the UK and indicated that it supported replacing parts of 6.1 with references to the ISO standard in the future. On the basis of the comments, the UK withdrew their proposal.

3. IMPLEMENTATION OF RESOULUTION 1999/62 OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

4. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AGENDA 21
a) Global harmonization of systems of classification and labelling of chemicals

5. PROGRAMME OF WORK - The COE agreed to the following items for the 2001-2002 biennium:
a. Additional provisions for the transport of gases including requirements for welded, cryogenic, and composite gas cylinders;
b. Provisions for the transport of solid substances in bulk containers;
c. Revision of Division 6.2 provisions;
d. Criteria for the corrosiveness of liquids and solids belonging to Class 8, packing group III, for steel and aluminum;
e. Practical application for the classification of fireworks;
f. Classification of ammonium nitrate emulsions, suspensions and gels;
g. Cooperation with IAEA for amendments to Class 7 provisions and harmonization terminology;
h. Follow up to Agenda 21, Chapter 19, Programme Area B (In cooperation with ILO, OECD, and the GHS sub-committee, pursue global harmonization of systems of classification and labelling of chemicals, including
i. Criteria for flammable aerosols;
ii. Classification provisions for substances which in contact with water, emits toxic or corrosive gases;
iii. Classification provisions for substances hazardous to the aquatic environment
i. Indication of physical state in proper shipping names and assignments of UN number with respect to the physical state of the substance.
j. Development of a new harmonized UN pressure vessel test;
k. Substances prohibited for transport;
l. Performance testing for packagings;
m. Equivalence wall thickness formula for tanks;
n. Clarification of portable tank minimum test pressure values; and
o. Miscellaneous proposals of amendments to the Model Regulations.